GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 2010

+ + + + +

The Regular Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room, Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 6:30 p.m., Anthony J. Hood, Chairman, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

ANTHONY J. HOOD Chairman KONRAD SCHLATER Commissioner

PETER MAY Commissioner (NPS)

MICHAEL TURNBULL Commissioner FAIA, (AOC)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN Secretary

DONNA HANOUSEK Zoning Specialist ESTHER BUSHMAN General Counsel

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JENNIFER STEINGASSER

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

JACOB RITTING, ESQ.

This transcript constitutes the minutes from the Regular Meeting held on January 11, 2010.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WELCOME:
Anthony Hood 5
HEARING ACTION:
ZC CASE NO. 10-01
OP TEXT AMENDMENT TO AMEND C-3-C ZONE:
Jennifer Steingasser
MOTION TO APPROVE EXPEDITED HEARING OF
ZC CASE NO. 10-01 AND TO WAIVE THE LATE
FILING RULE
VOTE TO APPROVE EXPEDITED HEARING AND WAIVE LATE FILING RULE 21
WAIVE DATE FIDING RODE
FINAL ACTION:
ZC CASE NO. 06-01A
STEUART-H STREET, LLC-PUD MODIFICATION: 23
MOTION TO APPROVE 2 YEAR EXTENSION 25
VOTE TO APPROVE 2 YEAR EXTENSION 25
ZC CASE NO. 06-01B STEUART-H STREET, LLC-PUD MODIFICATION: 26
MOTION TO APPROVE PUD MODIFICATION 28
VOTE TO APPROVE PUD MODIFICATION
ZC CASE NO. 09-11 - OP TEXT AMENDMENT: 32
MOTION TO APPROVE TEXT AMENDMENT 33
VOTE TO APPROVE TEXT AMENDMENT 33
ZC CASE NO. 09-17A
D.C. PUBLIC LIBRARY - TEXT AMENDMENT: 34
MOTION TO APPROVE TEXT AMENDMENT 36
VOTE TO APPROVE TEXT AMENDMENT 3
ZC CASE NO. 09-17 - D.C. PUBLIC LIBRARY MAP AMENDMENT & SPECIAL EXCEPTION:
Ex. 39 - DDOT Report - Accepted 38
Ex. 40 - Applicant Filing - Accepted 38
DDOT:
Jeff Jennings40
MOTION TO APPROVE MAP AMENDMENT & SPECIAL
EXCEPTION 53
VOTE TO APPROVE MAP AMENDMENT & SPECIAL
FYCFDTTON 5/

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CORRESPONDENCE:

ZC CASE NO. 09-14 - SAFEWAY, INC.:	55
INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT REQUEST	
MOTION TO APPROVE INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT	
REQUEST	57
VOTE TO APPROVE INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT	
REQUEST	57
ADJOURN:	г.с
Anthony Hood	- 5と

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

CHAIRMAN HOOD:

2

1

6:32 p.m.

Okay. We're going

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

to go ahead and get started. This meeting will, please, come to order.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is January 11, 2010. My name is Anthony Hood. Joining me are Commissioners Schlater, May and Turnbull. We are also joined by the Office of Zoning staff and the Office of Planning staff and Office of the Attorney General staff.

Copies of today's meeting agenda are available to you and are located in the bin near the door.

Please, be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by the Court Reporter is also webcast live. and Accordingly, we must ask you to refrain from any disruptive noises or actions in hearing room.

Please, turn off all beepers and

cell phones.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Does the staff have any preliminary matters?

MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: If not, let us proceed with the agenda. The first hearing action, Zoning Commission Case No. 10-01, Office of Planning Text Amendment to amend the C-3-C Zone District. Ms. Steingasser?

MS. STEINGASSER: Commissioner Hood, the Office of Planning is recommending a set down of a text amendment to allow, as a matter-of-right now, development for projects related to approve new community plans and for affordable housing projects funded by the city to achieve equivalent density and height in TDR the Zones as if they were to purchased TDRs without such purchase.

In our original report, we recommended a special exception review be provided to these projects in lieu of the PUD, which is the other option for this zone.

After discussions with the Office of Attorney General, they had some The solution soon became more complex than the problem and SO we are straightforward recommending a matter-ofright. We think we will achieve all the goals.

it's in Wе think the public interest to allow affordable housing projects, communities or small area planned equivalence approved by Council with a very strong public purpose. I have attached some excerpts from that in our staff report.

And we are recommending now revised language, I believe was provided to you this evening by OAG.

HOOD: CHAIRMAN Okay. Commissioners, this is revised language. Thank you, Ms. Steingasser. That was presented to us this evening. Unless someone or questions has any comments for Ms. Steingasser? Commissioner May?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

COMMISSIONER MAY: I remember there being significant discussion in some of the Zoning Regulation rewrite about TDRs. And I'm wondering how is this going to mesh with the future Zoning Regulations?

MS. STEINGASSER: This would not conflict with the future Zoning Regulations. What we found in our preliminary study of TDRs was that there is a far greater capacity to receive TDRs than there is a capacity at this point to generate. So this would not conflict with the market of TDRs.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. And then the second thing is one of the statements in the report is that this is not -- this is an alternative, in essence, to a PUD. And I'm wondering for projects that are as big as we anticipate this to be, I guess, or at least I'm anticipating this to be, I mean, a PUD doesn't seem overly burdensome and actually is an appropriate method for allowing this kind of, Ι quess, zoning for this sort

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

development.

MS. STEINGASSER: Well, the reason we felt the PUD was actually an excessive burden on the new communities and the affordable housing project was both the time involved and the participation necessary when the project itself is its own amenity.

You know, the benefit is that it is affordable housing. The city is already invested in the project, either through funding of the new communities projects or through funding of an individual affordable housing project.

So the benefits and the amenities were already pre-established. So it just became a question of why go through the full set down, the public hearing, the public coordination when the other issues of a PUD would be adverse impact and public capacity, which we thought could be addressed through the special exception standards.

COMMISSIONER MAY: But we are not

going to have those now.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. STEINGASSER: But now we are no longer recommending that.

COMMISSIONER MAY: And so how do we address those issues?

MS. STEINGASSER: We don't. It was discussed with the Office of Attorney General that these areas are all identified. They are transfer-of-development-rights receiving zones. They are identified in the Comprehensive Plan as areas that are already appropriate for the highest possible density within the city.

All projects that are currently capable of affording and purchasing transfer-of-development-rights can go upwards to the 10 FAR and 130 feet with absolutely no design review. So it was felt that to assign a review to only affordable housing projects actually antithetical to what we were proposing, which that it was created arbitrary burden an affordable housing on

1	project that was not applicable to other
2	projects in the same geographic boundary.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: This is going
4	to be an interesting hearing. I just have
5	this feeling that we are opening the door to
6	potentially undesirable consequences as a
7	result of this as a matter-of-right and not
8	subjecting something this large to a PUD.
9	I mean, I would think that
10	anything this large would likely come before
11	us as a PUD in the first place. So it's
12	MS. STEINGASSER: Well, that's
13	why
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: I just have
15	we don't have a lot to react to yet.
16	MS. STEINGASSER: Yes.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: We certainly
18	haven't had any public input on it, so I just
19	had that sense.
20	MS. STEINGASSER: Well, it's
21	narrowly defined so that it has to be an
22	affordable housing project. It has to

which is basically a project that is already coming equipped with its benefits and amenities and recognized public interest.

It has to also be funded by the District Government. So what we are doing is we are leaving the burden of additional public burdens of funding an already publicly funded project. And it is constrained only to the receiving zones where there is already that equivalent height and density that has no design review.

I'm COMMISSIONER MAY: just The particular development that you curious. suggesting hearing are that this be consolidated with at 2 M Street, N.E., I mean, that Northwest One New Community has been in the works for three years, something like that.

MS. STEINGASSER: Closer to five.

Between the planning process, working with
the community.

COMMISSIONER MAY: So five years.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 And now we have this need for this urgent 2 zoning. 3 MS. STEINGASSER: That's correct. 4 COMMISSIONER MAY: And what has 5 happened all the years leading up to this? 6 Was there some other thought about how this 7 was going to be accomplished? 8 MS. STEINGASSER: Well --COMMISSIONER MAY: I mean, why is 9 10 it all of a sudden now very important? Well, it 11 MS. STEINGASSER: always been very important. New communities --12 13 COMMISSIONER MAY: Why is this solution now very important? 14 15 MS. STEINGASSER: Because part of 16 the community plan requires the new development of parcels that are within the TDR 17 Receiving Zones. They are to create a mixed 18 19 income buildings. The market share of which 20 will help fund underwrite and the affordability on the western side of North 21

Capitol Street.

1	So it's that relationship of
2	having market rate funds to help support the
3	affordability requirements of that. The
4	project has been moving forward. You know,
5	it's the same story that the private
6	development communities are telling about the
7	ability to get financing, the ability to
8	either work through bonds or financing and it
9	just hasn't materialized.
10	The project is close to being
11	ready to go. We felt this was the most
12	expeditious way to move that project along.
13	I want to be clear that if we set
14	down the alternative language, the project in
15	question would not be before the Commission.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
17	MS. STEINGASSER: So we would not
18	need to waive any set downs.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Will the
20	hearing still need to be expedited?
21	MS. STEINGASSER: I believe so,
22	yes, to get this effective so that the

applicant can go to building permit.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

COMMISSIONER MAY: All right. And since all we're doing at this Okay. moment is deciding whether or not to have a I don't feel hearing, Ι mean, totally comfortable with the amount of information we It seems like it's all coming very quickly without a lot of background. And the fact that we're getting revised language, you know, today, doesn't make me feel much better.

I'm not saying it's enough to make me not want to set it down, but I'm just anxious about it. That's it for me for my questions.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you,

Commissioner May. Commissioner Turnbull?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just have one. I can't recall the street sizes around all the receiving zones. I'm assuming that the 130 feet, the Height Act, this all falls under the Height Act?

1	MS. STEINGASSER: Absolutely.
2	North Capitol and 1 st Street both are capable
3	of generating 130 foot buildings.
4	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Commissioner
6	Schlater?
7	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Mr.
8	Chairman, I just want to say for the record
9	that I have to recuse myself on this case,
10	because my employer, William C. Smith &
11	Company is the developer at the Northwest One
12	New Community and so I won't be able to sit on
13	this case. Thanks.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you very
15	much, Commissioner Schlater.
16	Well, I'm not sure where my
17	colleagues are. I think, you know, I have
18	seen a lot of things change and a lot of
19	things happen. And as Commissioner May has
20	already mentioned, this will make a very
21	interesting hearing.

I think we need to go forward and

1	see how interesting it is going to be. And
2	also, I am in tune to looking at the
3	alternative language, which would take out, I
4	believe, 2 nd and M Street, unless someone
5	feels otherwise.
6	And I think that's what we're
7	being asked to look at the language, in which
8	I think all the parties, at this point, OP and
9	OAG, have agreed that it's legally sufficient
10	for us to move forward.
11	I would be in support. And
12	because there is three of us, I want to see if
13	all of us are in support of moving forward
14	with this.
15	So I would move approval of the
16	revised language of 771.4 that was submitted
17	to us tonight and also expediting. I don't
18	know what that means. Do we cut the 45 days
19	or what are we talking about?
20	MS. STEINGASSER: It cuts about 10
21	days off.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIRMAN HOOD:

22

Oh, 10 days off,

1	okay. And expedited request that we and staff
2	work and try to expedite this hearing as soon
3	as possible.
4	We can't do it next week, can we?
5	Oh, and also waive the rules for the late
6	report. This looks like things are still
7	running, so we will forgive and waive the
8	rules for the late report.
9	Okay. So is that all we need to
10	do?
11	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
13	COMMISSIONER MAY: I was wondering
14	if I could ask a question of OAG?
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Could I do this?
16	Could we accept the motion or is this
17	something that is going to be added to the
18	motion, because that way it won't be repeated?
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: It might. It
20	might.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, hold
22	that caveat and Commissioner May, let's ask

1	the question.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, I mean,
3	if you made a motion and we get a second and
4	then discuss it.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Your's may need to
6	be added, so
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right, right.
8	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: The question I
10	had was I understand why special exception
11	review wouldn't necessarily make sense, but
12	I'm wondering whether the sort of one-time
13	design review that we do at Capitol Gateway in
14	that overlay, not Capitol Gateway, Capitol
15	what's the Capitol South area, what is
16	that?
17	MS. STEINGASSER: Capitol Gateway.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: That's Capitol
19	Gateway.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Overlay.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: Capitol Gateway
22	Overlay, that sort of one-step design review,

1	whether we could institute something like that
2	in cases where this is going to be executed
3	simply because there is that extra density?
4	I know that we did that extra
5	density case
6	MR. RITTING: Yes, the concern is
7	the same with I apologize if that sounds a
8	little too loud. I'm not quite sure what is
9	going on with the volume. But the legal
10	concern is the same whether it is a one-step
11	design review or a special exception type
12	review.
13	(Audio system failure for approx 5
14	seconds.)
15	MR. RITTING: So creating some
16	other form of review doesn't solve that
17	problem.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. Okay. So
19	I guess it doesn't change the motion. But
20	that is something that I would like to talk
21	about a little more. Thanks.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you

1	very much. Can I get a second?
2	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly
4	seconded. Any further discussion?
5	All those in favor?
6	ALL: Aye.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: We did include in
8	that motion waive the report? Yes. Any
9	opposition? Not hearing none, Ms. Schellin,
10	would you, please, record the vote?
11	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records
12	the vote 3-0-2 to set down Zoning Commission
13	Case No. 10-01 and to approve the expedited
14	hearing and to waive the rules for receiving
15	the late submittal of OP's report.
16	Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner
17	Turnbull seconding, Commissioner May
18	approving, Commissioner Keating not present,
19	not voting, Commissioner Schlater not voting
20	having recused himself.
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's move
22	to final action. Also, let me acknowledge we

1	have Mr. Jennings from DDOT. He was trying to
_	nave m. cemmings from bbot. He was crying to
2	hide down there. We want to make sure and
3	forgive me for not acknowledging you earlier.
4	We always like it when we see DDOT.
5	Say it in the mike, so we can get
6	that on record.
7	MR. JENNINGS: It's a pleasure to
8	be here.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's a pleasure to
10	be here?
11	MR. JENNINGS: I always enjoy
12	being here. Thank you. Thank you very much,
13	Jeff Jennings for the record.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: All right. Thank
15	you, Mr. Jennings.
16	MR. JENNINGS: Thanks.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go to
18	final action. Zoning Commission Case you
19	know what, I need to switch these after
20	looking at it, Commissioners. Let's take B
21	first and A second.
22	Let's do Zoning Commission Case

1 06-01A, Steuart-H Street, LLC, two-year 2 time extension at Square 776. Ms. Schellin? 3 MS. SCHELLIN: This was a request that was filed, I believe, back in the summer 4 5 and the Commission had it on its agenda back 6 in September. And at that time, the 7 Commission decided to defer action until it had the hearing on the PUD Modification Case 8 06-01B. 9 10 So the two-year time extension is before you. We did receive a letter from the 11 applicant saying that they were withdrawing 12 13 their request. However, I believe OAG has indicated they believe that this request is 14 15 still valid. 16 CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I would agree, because I think without the extension, you 17 don't have a modification. I would agree I 18 19 believe that is what OAG has advised us. And, 20 Mr. Ritting, if you want to add to that? RITTING: To just expand on 21 that slightly, the applicant's theory is that

the time extension is not required because they filed a modification request. I disagree with that, because I believe that they are required under the Zoning Regulations to justify their time extension request under Regulation No. 204.810.

They did submit in the companion case for the time extension a justification for that, so I believe that it is certainly warranted that you would take action on that tonight.

However, I believe their withdrawal was based on a false assumption.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I would agree. I mean, but very creative, but I would agree with what Mr. Ritting said. Any of my colleagues want to comment on that?

Okay. What I would like to do is move approval for the time extension, even though -- and just accept the letter 06-01A, Exhibit 5, so noted. But I would think that as it has already been stated that we need to

NEAL R. GROSS

move on the time extension. 1 2 I think they have made their case, 3 especially with economic conditions in this day and time, so I would move approval of 4 5 Zoning Commission Case No. 06-01, two-year PUD 6 time -- well, you know what, let me just say 7 it from now. A two-year time extension, twoyear PUD time extension at Square 776 and ask 8 for a second. 9 10 COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Second. CHAIRMAN HOOD: It is moved and 11 Any further discussion? 12 seconded. 13 All those in favor? 14 ALL: Aye. 15 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any 16 opposition of those present, Ms. Schellin, would you record the vote? 17 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records 18 19 the vote 4-0-1 to approve final action in 20 Zoning Commission 06-01A, Case No. moving, 21 Commissioner Hood Commissioner

NEAL R. GROSS

Schlater seconding, Commissioners

22

May

1	Turnbull in support, Commissioner Keating not
2	present, not voting.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next we
4	have Zoning Commission Case No. 06-01B,
5	Steuart H-Street, LLC, PUD Modification at
6	Square 776. And this is the PUD modification.
7	Ms. Schellin?
8	MS. SCHELLIN: This is before you
9	for final action. I don't believe we got
10	anything additional before you, other than the
11	draft order.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Did NCPC comment?
13	NCPC didn't comment on this? Anyway, I don't
14	see it. Okay.
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: Did they
16	comment on PUD Modifications?
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Do they? I don't
18	know. That's a good question. I read so
19	much, I don't remember.
20	COMMISSIONER MAY: For some
21	reason, I don't think so. I don't remember it
22	being on the NCPC agenda, but

1	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, I
2	don't see it. Maybe they don't. Okay.
3	COMMISSIONER MAY: I don't think
4	they do. I don't think they actually come.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I think the
6	big issue was it was always one of those
7	questions that you just don't remember.
8	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's a sticking
10	question. Now, we've got to find the answer
11	to it, because I don't remember.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Maybe Ms.
13	Schellin knows.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin, does
15	NCPC comment on PUD modification?
16	MS. SCHELLIN: We send them
17	everything, but they are not required to, no.
18	But we do send them everything. We can have
19	Ms. Hanousek check the file to see if it came
20	in, if you would like?
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's okay. If
22	we don't have it in front of us or can't find

1 it, I just wanted to acknowledge. 2 MS. SCHELLIN: We did not have 3 anything as of today. 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okav. So again, I think the issue here, the plans are 5 6 changed and I think we saw that. I think we 7 fleshed this out during proposed and I don't 8 have anything to add. Let me open it up to my colleagues. Okay. 9 10 Not seeing anything, I would move that we approve this PUD Modification. But in 11 this motion, I would ask to work with OAG that 12 13 we can make them end together. I don't know how that works, but, you know, like the time 14 15 extension for two-years from a certain date 16 and it's going to end at a certain time. And I think we need to bring those 17 two together, so some parity there. 18 19 MR. RITTING: Yes, I can certainly 20 consolidate the orders into two one 21 include the findings necessary to justify the 22 time extension and the order granting the PUD Modification.

You bring up a related issue which is the timing of the extension, i.e., how long does it last? I believe the applicant was under the impression when they submitted their letter requesting to withdraw the time extension request, that by granting the PUD Modification, you would make the order valid for two years from the date the order is issued.

That, in effect, would grant a slightly longer time extension than was originally applied for in their time extension request, which expired in October. So suppose we issue the order tomorrow, that would mean it would be a time extension for two years and three months.

If you believe that that's a warranted amount of time and it certainly would be for purposes of administrative efficiency useful to have the PUD Modification expire -- or rather the original expire at the

1	same time as the modification.
2	In fact, it seems kind of silly to
3	have them expire at different times. I could
4	do that so that the term would be the same.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, whatever it
6	is, that sounded good. So unless my
7	colleagues object, that you do just that
8	whatever it is. Commissioner May?
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. I just
10	wanted to comment. I assume that the
11	conditions of the revised order are going to
12	be essentially the same except for the changes
13	that we discussed in the hearing, right?
14	MR. RITTING: Well, that brings up
15	a point that I mentioned on the draft that I
16	sent you about the condition for the grocery
17	store.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right.
19	MR. RITTING: I noticed in
20	reviewing the draft modification order that a
21	condition requiring the grocery store of a
22	certain size to be included in the project was

1	absent from the draft modification order
2	submitted by the applicant.
3	I think it would be unusual for
4	you to withdraw a condition that you included
5	in the original PUD order through a
6	modification order, especially given that
7	there was no evidence in the record at the
8	modification hearing that they were seeking to
9	withdraw that condition.
10	COMMISSIONER MAY: I agree with
11	that. I mean, it wasn't explicitly requested.
12	There was no testimony or evidence at the
13	hearing about withdrawing it, so I would
14	assume it would still be a condition.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think we have a
16	general consensus up here to exactly that.
17	Are there any other discussion?
18	Oh, I need a second, okay.
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: I had already
21	moved. Okay. Commissioner May seconding.
22	Any further discussion?

1	All those in favor?
2	ALL: Aye.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Ms. Schellin,
4	would you record the vote, not hearing any
5	folks against? Do we have a proxy?
6	MS. SCHELLIN: No.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
8	MS. SCHELLIN: He didn't
9	participate.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
11	MS. SCHELLIN: So staff records
12	the vote 4-0-1 to approve final action on
12	Zoning Commission Case No. 06-01B,
13	Zoning Commission Case No. 06-01B,
13	Zoning Commission Case No. 06-01B, Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner May
13 14 15	Zoning Commission Case No. 06-01B, Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner May seconding, Commissioner Schlater and Turnbull
13 14 15 16	Zoning Commission Case No. 06-01B, Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner May seconding, Commissioner Schlater and Turnbull in support or in favor, Commissioner Keating
13 14 15 16 17	Zoning Commission Case No. 06-01B, Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner May seconding, Commissioner Schlater and Turnbull in support or in favor, Commissioner Keating not voting, not present, having not
13 14 15 16 17	Zoning Commission Case No. 06-01B, Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner May seconding, Commissioner Schlater and Turnbull in support or in favor, Commissioner Keating not voting, not present, having not participated.
13 14 15 16 17 18	Zoning Commission Case No. 06-01B, Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner May seconding, Commissioner Schlater and Turnbull in support or in favor, Commissioner Keating not voting, not present, having not participated. CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you,

1	Amendment re: retail and services used in SP
2	Zone Districts. Ms. Schellin?
3	MS. SCHELLIN: We did receive an
4	NCPC report at Exhibit 13 in this case.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
6	Any discussion on 09-11? Any discussion? I
7	will move that we approve 09-11 and also
8	acknowledge the NCPC report as no adverse
9	impacts and ask for a second.
10	COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Second.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly
12	seconded. Further discussion?
13	All those in favor?
14	ALL: Aye.
15	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
16	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the
17	vote?
18	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff records
19	the vote 4-0-1 to approve final action in
20	Zoning Commission Case No. 09-11, Commissioner
21	Hood moving, Commissioner Schlater seconding,
22	Commissioners May and Turnbull in support,

1	Commissioner Keating not present, not voting.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next,
3	Zoning Commission Case No. 09-17A, D.C. Public
4	Library - Text Amendment pertaining to all
5	public libraries. Ms. Schellin?
6	MS. SCHELLIN: This is before you
7	for final action. And I don't think we have
8	an NCPC report. We do not. So we have the
9	proposed rule making, a copy of that before
10	you and I would ask that the Commission
11	consider final action.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you, Ms.
13	Schellin. Any comments, Commissioners?
14	COMMISSIONER MAY: Are we sure
15	there is not something from NCPC? Because I'm
16	certain it was voted upon at NCPC.
17	MS. SCHELLIN: Ms. Hanousek will
18	go and check, but I have not seen anything. I
19	did not see anything come in today.
20	CHAIRMAN HOOD: You want to wait
21	before we do that to see?
22	COMMISSIONER MAY: I think we can

1	continue the discussion, because there are a
2	couple of other items we need to discuss.
3	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Let's go
4	right ahead. Any discussion?
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: Well, there
6	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Mr. May?
7	COMMISSIONER MAY: We have late
8	submissions to address?
9	MS. SCHELLIN: This is the rule
10	making case.
11	COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, it's the
12	rule making, oh, got it, okay, sorry.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, I really
14	believe the next discussion, the next case,
15	we're going to have a little discussion.
16	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: And I'm glad Mr.
18	Jennings
19	COMMISSIONER MAY: Sorry, I got
20	it
21	CHAIRMAN HOOD: came down just
22	for that.

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: mixed up.
2	CHAIRMAN HOOD: So yes, I was
3	trying to hurry and get to that. I know Mr.
4	Jennings is going to stay around for that last
5	one.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: All right.
7	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Are we fine? Any
8	issues with this?
9	COMMISSIONER MAY: No issues.
10	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Well, I
11	would move approval of Zoning Commission 09-
12	17A and ask
13	MR. COLLINS: Excuse me, Chairman
14	Hood, just to clarify, we do not have an NCPC
15	report.
16	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
17	COMMISSIONER MAY: Sorry.
18	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Of 09-17A, D.C.
19	Public Libraries - Text Amendments, public
20	libraries, and ask for a second.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
22	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly

1	seconded. Any further discussion?
2	All those in favor?
3	ALL: Aye.
4	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
5	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the
6	vote?
7	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff would
8	record the vote 5-0-0 to approve final action
9	in Zoning Commission Case No. 09-17A,
10	Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner
11	Turnbull seconding, Commissioners May and
12	Schlater in support, Commissioner Keating in
13	support by absentee ballot.
14	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Next,
15	Zoning Commission Case No. 09-17, D.C. Public
16	Library - Map Amendment and Special Exception
17	at Part of Parcel 207/64. Ms. Schellin?
18	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, sir. On this
19	one, we did have one item. Actually, I
20	believe there actually may be two items that
21	came in after the record closed. I believe
22	DDOT's report also came in after the record

1	alogod Exhibit 30 and then Exhibit 40 was a
Τ	closed, Exhibit 39, and then Exhibit 40 was a
2	filing by the applicant. So if the Commission
3	so desires to open the record to accept those
4	filings?
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So we need
6	to open the record for 39 and 40. What about
7	36?
8	MS. SCHELLIN: It came in.
9	CHAIRMAN HOOD: It came in on
10	time?
11	MS. SCHELLIN: Right.
12	CHAIRMAN HOOD: The ANC? Great.
13	Okay. Commissioners, any problems with
14	opening the record for 39, Exhibit 39, DDOT's
15	report, and the applicant's response to DDOT's
16	report on 40? Any problems with letting those
17	in? Okay. All right. So ordered by
18	consensus both of those will be admitted.
19	We may take this one a little bit
20	out. We may have some questions for Mr.
21	Jennings.
22	Mr. Jennings, I'm going to start

off and ask you if you would be so kind to help me. Explain in your report that you submitted, and I'm trying to find exactly the particular language, "DDOT's six-year spending plan is fully committed and leaves no available budget room, at this time. There is a need for additional safety along the portion of Alabama Avenue."

You know, unfortunately, I mean, not unfortunately, fortunately, and I'm glad to have a job, but I work in the Federal Government, so I'm not sure some times how intergovernment works some times in the District.

But it seems to me that DDOT is the one who is responsible for any streets and should be working along with DCPL to try to accommodate some of those issues. And I'm not sure. And you're saying that the money is all -- or DDOT's budget has been spent, so I'm not sure how do we achieve, how do we get to the point of even looking at some of those issues

NEAL R. GROSS

that may have come up?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. JENNINGS: That's a very good point. Once again, for the record, my name is Jeff Jennings. Ι work for the District Department of Transportation. The Six-Year Spending Plan has been obligated. And with respect to agencies that have projects that they wish to see get done in a certain amount of time, I'll give you a very good example.

We have recently had the folks who are working on the Wilson Senior High School in Upper Northwest approach DDOT and they have actually taken into consideration a lot of traffic calming construction around Wilson High School, which they approached us with in the last couple of months. And we like the sound of it and they were fully aware that this was going to be part of their own budget in order to accomplish this.

They wanted DDOT construction crews as well as DDOT planning and policy staff to review everything they were doing in

NEAL R. GROSS

advance of moving forward with that work.

I think this is a case where we didn't know anything about this particular library lack of parking, I guess, which perhaps is causing a little bit of this conversation we are having today.

And as we stated in the report, that's a good thing. Perhaps more things need to be done to accompany the lack of parking that is going to happen here at this site.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: So the long and short of it is you're looking for DCPL to do like Wilson High School more or less and put some of those traffic mitigations and parking issues in their budget and accommodate it?

MR. JENNINGS: As we discussed at our meeting with DCPL, you know, we certainly let them know that trying to find the money at this point in time would not be an easy process. And we would perhaps like for them to move forward with those ideas that we suggested to them at that meeting in December,

NEAL R. GROSS

but, of course, much of our budget, as has been stated here, is spoken for.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I don't know how much of this is within our control. I mean, we can surely ask. And it may be and it may not, but I just don't see this being a show stopper for me. I would just again courteously ask both agencies to continue to work together, so you can achieve what DDOT has issued.

Because you guys are the professionals, but also the experts. We know you are professionals, but you all are the experts, and also continue to work with DCPL.

I'm not sure, but let me open it up to my other Commissioners who may want to comment on any of this. Commissioner Schlater?

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Mr.

Chairman, just a point of clarification on

DDOT's position here. It says "The District

Department of Transportation does not disagree

with the applicant's request for an amendment

NEAL R. GROSS

1 to the Zoning Map." 2 Does that mean DDOT agrees 3 the applicant's request for an amendment to the Zoning Map? 4 5 JENNINGS: I think we take a 6 position where we like the idea of this 7 library project moving forward. I don't think you are necessarily seeing language used here 8 where we're giving it full-fledged approval. 9 10 We would like DCPL to come to DDOT similar fashion to what the DCPS folks and the 11 Facility's 12 Office of folks did with 13 example I cited earlier. That would have made it perhaps a 14 15 much easier process than what are 16 experiencing right now. SCHLATER: COMMISSIONER 17 Do you think ultimately that that is a zoning issue 18 19 or an intergovernmental coordination issue? 20 MR. That's JENNINGS: а great And I don't know if I have the question. 21

answer to that here tonight.

COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Okay. I think I come down on the side of it being an intergovernmental issue.

MR. JENNINGS: And, Mr. Chairman, just for kind of the sake of example, what I received recently in the last couple of weeks or so since we have had this meeting with DCPL is that this intersection that we are dealing with, that's mentioned here in our report, it's a precarious intersection, this T-intersection that we are dealing with.

And I think that's why we are trying to make it as much of a point here as possible. I even received an email recently from somebody in the community stating that there was a near miss of two young people at this intersection that just happened in the middle of the week last week.

So I do hope that, you know, as you put it pretty well, we can move forward in a positive way with this. You know, this project is a very, very good project. And we

NEAL R. GROSS

don't necessarily want to stand in the way of this.

But there also comes a point where we know in three or four years or whenever the library is completed this intersection will see much more activity than what it is seeing at the current time with the school, Beers Elementary School, being practically next door, students from Beers visiting the Francis Gregory Library after school. We will continue to see circumstances like what we saw just last week or I heard about.

I even brought the email from the community person with me here tonight.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Maybe we need to do some reprogramming of dollars, because if that issue is going on now, then I would encourage DDOT to do all they can to deal with the issues out there now.

This kind of reminds me of another case we had previously. It was on Martin Luther King Avenue. You know, there was a

NEAL R. GROSS

situation that was already existing. So I would just -- and I know you are saying that the budget has been out for six years, but I don't know if I would put all that strain on this applicant, because we already have an issue out there.

That email you have for, I guess, young folks who almost were hit I don't know what it says in the something? email, but you alluded to that. So there is I don't know if it is issue. this an applicant's issue, but again, I would hope DDOT and the applicant that both continue to work together and move forward.

At least that's where I'm going to come down on it. Okay. Commissioner May?

COMMISSIONER MAY: Yes. You cite the example of Wilson High School. Which entity at Wilson actually approached you about this? Was it OPEFM or D.C. Public Schools or was it the Wilson High School Corporation? What?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 MR. JENNINGS: DCPS and OPEFM sat 2 in the meeting together. 3 COMMISSIONER MAY: Both of them in 4 the meeting together. And OPEFM was willing 5 to put up the money for the traffic calming 6 measures? 7 Т don't remember JENNINGS: 8 who said we would be willing to put up the money, but they both sat there and said this 9 10 is going to happen. 11 COMMISSIONER MAY: You know, understand the desirability of having that 12 13 kind of a situation. I don't know that either the D.C. Public Libraries are in the same 14 15 situation to be able to respond like that in 16 that circumstance, I'm not how SO sure completely relevant that example is. 17 I also know, I mean, the Wilson 18 19 High School community is very active and it 20 would not surprise me at all if they were able to persuade DDOT to pay for this if 21

hadn't already convinced DCPS or OPEFM.

You know, some of the stuff that we are talking about is basic traffic calming that, you know, gets installed across the city some times with less than six-year planning. And so it seems to me that there is room to work something out.

And frankly, whether it comes from DCPS' budget or whether it comes from DDOT's budget, at this point, it doesn't really make that much difference.

And, you know, like the Chairman I would really hope that both the applicant and DDOT would work this out, so that when this library opens, that it is safe for people to cross the street to get to it. And it certainly seems achievable to me and I don't know that we necessarily need to do anything different in our action tonight to make sure that that happens.

I think that the burden is on DDOT and DCPL to work together to resolve this.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any comments?

NEAL R. GROSS

Commissioner Turnbull?

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I guess I'm a little bit concerned that, at this point of the process, final action, we are suddenly hearing that we have a precarious situation at this intersection and they are looking for us to go ahead and approve this.

And we can go ahead and approve it, but precarious is the same as dangerous. I mean, unsafe. I just can't imagine that this hasn't risen up a level to say we have got an issue here for a public entity that needs to open and we are not working together to do this.

I would agree with Commissioner May that this is ridiculous. I mean, this is the first time I have heard DDOT refer to an intersection as precarious. So it just strikes me we are at final action and we are—what do you do?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I think DDOT

NEAL R. GROSS

mentioned, and Mr. Jennings alluded to again tonight, DDOT was unaware of this project, right?

MR. JENNINGS: I had seen it on the zoning calendar earlier last year. It didn't necessarily rise to the level of where DDOT needed to make comments at that point in time. We became much more aware of the case when this panel here suggested for the applicant to meet with transportation because of the lack of parking in a private lot.

That parking, as I think you may have noted or observed at the earlier case, earlier hearing, will happen along the street.

And I think there may have been some earlier discussion as well. More pedestrians will be accessing this site, because there will be less parking.

So we met with the applicant December $17^{\rm th}$ and we came to the suggestions that we came to for DCPL during that meeting.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman, i

NEAL R. GROSS

would note that we received, in one of them, the filings, from, I guess, the applicant, the February 6, 2009 report from DDOT which gave its support to the project. It didn't address any of the pedestrian crossing concerns.

Ιt was focused mostly on the parking issue. I understand, Mr. Jennings, you may not have been aware of it, at that time, because it was not signed by you or initialed by you. But I don't think it is completely correct to that DDOT say unaware of the project.

I think that some of these issue arose relatively recently. So I don't think, you know, the issue of when it actually came the forefront and DDOT's planning is to vitally important at this time. I think it important became as the result of our deliberations. And Ι think that it's important that it be addressed.

And you know, I don't know that we necessarily have much more that we could do to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

make sure that it is, but, you know, if there are more near misses and more emails about that or if, God forbid, something really bad should happen at that intersection, I have to believe that there will be crews out there pretty quickly trying to install devices to fix things once the new library is open.

And I think they will figure out who pays for it without any trouble.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: I would agree with your comments, Commissioner May. And all of my colleagues and their comments. I think not to belabor, because if not, if we keep going, those mitigation methods will probably be out there. They will have taken care of that while we're sitting here talking about it.

But I will tell you that I think all the comments were heard, it's a part of the record. I'm hoping that those agencies will continue to work together along with the community. As was mentioned, the near miss, as Commissioner May said those things don't

NEAL R. GROSS

happen long. Somebody is going to find some money in this city to get that taken care of.

Okay. So I think we are fully on record as Commissioners, because part of our charge is to protect the residents of the District of Columbia and all parties involved.

And I think we have expressed that in our deliberations and in our conversation here.

And I also don't want to not go on notice the work of Ms. Bray, who put together a nice package and response to the three page letter. We got a nice -- I thought it was a hearing package at first, but we got a nice response to it and all the work that she did.

Mr. Jennings, you're not upset with us, are you? So what I would do is acknowledge her. I like the work that she put into this response.

So anyway, I would move approval of Zoning Commission Case No. 09-17 and also in that approval let us be on record for the concern of making sure that the agencies work

NEAL R. GROSS

1 together to try to mitigate some of 2 issues that may occur out there before they 3 happen and ask for a second. COMMISSIONER SCHLATER: Second. 4 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly 5 Further discussion? 6 seconded. 7 All those in favor? ALL: Aye. 8 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition? 9 10 So ordered. Staff, Ms. Schellin, would you record the vote with the proxy? 11 MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records 12 the vote 5-0-0 to approve final action in 13 Zoning Commission Case No. 09-17, Commissioner 14 15 Hood moving, Commissioner Schlater seconding, 16 Commissioners May, Turnbull in support, Commissioner Keating in support by absentee 17 ballot. 18 19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Again, I think it 20 needs to be said while we may not always agree with DDOT, we definitely appreciate, and if 21

you all could make sure Mr. Jennings either

watched the webcast live rerun, but we definitely appreciate DDOT coming down. And I do not want that to go unmentioned, because we do appreciate the thought and the interest in which they provide us.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Yes, sir?

add that, I mean, the fact that Mr. Jennings was here for this meeting as opposed to simply coming to a hearing, which is what they normally do, I think is especially noteworthy, because he anticipated there would be some discussion on it. And it was very helpful to the Commission having him here.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: That's great. Yes, I definitely agree.

with Okay. Let's move on agenda. I we have correspondence on saw Zoning Commission Case No. 09-14, Safeway, Letter from applicant requesting indefinitely postponement of January 14th

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

hearing. Ms. Schellin?

MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, this is a request from the applicant asking for an indefinite postponement. The applicant needs some time to go back and address some issues that, I believe, the Office of Planning has brought up and also the community.

And so they would like to have an indefinite postponement to work with the community and work with the Office of Planning. And when they feel they have done that, then they will contact us when they are ready to schedule a new hearing.

CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Commissioners, we have a request. We also have a request Office of Planning said that they would not be submitting a public hearing report at this time. So you know, there are a number of factors that we don't really have in front of us to weigh to begin with.

It looks like there is going to be more collaboration between all the parties

NEAL R. GROSS

1	involved and they are asking that we do this
2	indefinitely, so they can work out all the
3	kinks. And it appears that you guys possibly
4	only have a five minute hearing on this case.
5	So with that said, do we need to
6	do a motion on this indefinite postponement?
7	Somebody would like to do it or you would like
8	me to do it?
9	Okay. I would move that we
10	postpone 09-14 indefinitely and ask for a
11	second.
12	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Second.
13	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly
14	seconded. Any further discussion?
15	All those in favor?
16	ALL: Aye.
17	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Not hearing any
18	opposition, Ms. Schellin, would you record the
19	vote?
20	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff records
21	the vote 4-0-1 to approve the request for an
22	indefinite postponement of the hearing in

1	Zoning Commission Case No. 09-14, Commissioner
2	Hood moving, Commissioner Turnbull seconding,
3	Commissioners May, Schlater in support,
4	Commissioner Keating not present, not voting.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I want to
6	thank everyone for their participation
7	tonight.
8	Ms. Schellin, do we have anything
9	else in front of us?
LO	MS. SCHELLIN: No, sir, that's it.
11	CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. With that,
12	this meeting is adjourned.
13	
L 4	
15	
L 6	
L7	
18	
19	
20	
21	